

Results of the 2012-2013 FEPT and TOEIC Tests

## **Results of the 2012-2013 FEPT and TOEIC Tests**

**Jeff Hull**, Asia University

### **Abstract**

This article is a review of the results of the Freshman English Placement Test (FEPT), administered at Asia University in April 2012 and January 2013, and the results of the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), administered to students who participated in the Asia University America Program (AUAP) in 2012-2013 (Cycle 2) and 2013 (Cycle 1). I calculated average total test scores for the four Asia University faculties that took the FEPT and nearly all of the TOEIC tests that were administered to AUAP students. I did not include the results of the practice TOEIC tests administered to the International Relations students. I included scores for the individual sections of the two exams in order to provide more details of the results. Scores for students who took the FEPT at the beginning and end of the academic year improved for all four faculties. This improvement included total scores as well as scores for each of the two main sections of the test although in two cases of the section scores there were only fractional increases. With the exception of the August 2013 TOEIC test for third year International Relations students, average total scores and section scores also improved for the different administrations of the TOEIC test.

### **2012/2013 FEPT Administration and Methodology**

In April of 2012, 1178 entering first-year students in the Business Administration, Business Hospitality, Law, and Economics Faculties took the FEPT test, and at the end of the academic year in January of 2013, 902 first-year students from those same faculties took the test a second time. The

April test was used to place students into Freshman English (FE) classes while the January test was used to place students into English classes in their sophomore year.

### **Results of the FEPT**

I calculated average test scores for both administrations of the test for the four Asia University faculties. I included scores for both the listening section and the vocabulary, grammar, and reading section of the test in order to present more detailed results.

As shown in Table A, the average total scores of students who took the April 2012 and January 2013 tests improved for all four faculties. For the January test, Business Administration showed an increase of four points while Business Hospitality, Law, and Economics marked an increase of three points. On average across the four faculties, there was an increase of four points. This average increase is lower than those Messerklinger (2008, 2009) and Hull (2012) reported in the past, but this is not unexpected because of changes that were made in the test from Version 2.3 to 2.4. Version 2.4 of the FEPT, the test administered during the 2012-2013 academic year, is a 75-item test, whereas Version 2.3 that Messerklinger and Hull reported on previously is a 98-item test. Readers can find a full account of the changes made in the test for the 2012-2013 academic year in the 2012 and 2013 editions of the *CELE Journal* (Hull, 2012, pp. 34-38; Hull, 2013, pp. 1-17).

It is important to note here that the FEPT is not a test of achievement or proficiency. It is a norm-referenced test used for the sole purpose of rating students to make decisions about placement in Freshman English classes. No one has ever attempted to correlate the content of the test items with the

curriculum first-year students have in their English classes. Consequently, the increase in scores at the end of the year does not reflect in any direct way progress students have made in learning their first-year curriculum.

Furthermore, a scale of proficiency has never been developed for FEPT test scores, nor has an attempt ever been made to align the FEPT with other tests of proficiency. Although the range of student scores reflects a relatively higher or lower skill in English, it does not indicate what that level is.

Over the years that FEPT results have been reported in the *CELE Journal*, comparisons of pre- and post-test scores have been of limited value because a different number of students for all four faculties have taken the test in April and January. Differences in test administration at the beginning and end of the academic year, along with a lack of consistent student attendance, have been responsible for this. In April, before the start of classes, all freshman students, with the exception of the International Relations students, take the FEPT at the same time in large lecture halls. In January, on the other hand, students take the test in their Freshman English classes under the supervision of their individual FE teacher. Student absence from Freshman English classes in January results in a lower number of students taking the test at the end of the year, as seen in Table A.

Due to the onerous task of going through the results and eliminating scores of students from the entrance test who did not take the post-test, past reports of the results have always compared two groups of significantly different numbers of students. Looking at the results in Table A for 2012-2013 alone, we can see a difference of around 23% in the size of the two test groups. As a result, comparing entrance and end-of-year scores, as is shown in Table A, would not seem to result in an accurate comparison.

This year, however, I attempted to make an accurate comparison between

the pre- and post-scores by excluding all pre-test scores for students who did not have complete scores for the post-test. Table B shows that comparison. One important point revealed in Table B when a completely accurate comparison is made is that the results of the test are nearly identical to the traditional comparison between the two significantly different pre- and post-test groups, as shown in Table A. To be sure, there are some fractional differences between scores in how the departments performed on one or the other sections of the test, but those differences are statistically insignificant. Furthermore, when the totals are rounded to the nearest whole number, as they are in Table B, the results across departments are the same as when the comparison was uneven and included all students who took the pre-test with all the students who took the post-test. This indicates two things: one, that the comparisons considered incomplete in the past may very well have been accurate comparisons; and two, that performance across students and across administrations of the test is very consistent. Those who review the results of the FEPT in the future should make every attempt to follow this standard of arriving at an accurate comparison of the pre- and post-test results.

**TABLE A: Results of the 2012-2013 FEPT**

	<b>Business Administration</b>		<b>Business Hospitality</b>		<b>Law</b>		<b>Economics</b>		<b>All Faculties</b>	
	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan
Number of Examinees (change)	385	300 (-85)	97	77 (-20)	390	297 (-93)	306	228 (-78)	1178	902 (-276)
Mean Listening Score (change)	19	23 (+4)	22	24 (+2)	19	22 (+3)	19	22 (+3)	19	22 (+3)
Mean Vocab/Grammar/Rdg Score (change)	20	21 (+1)	20	20 (+0)	20	20 (+0)	20	20 (+0)	20	21 (+1)
Mean Total Score (change)	40	44 (+4)	41	44 (+3)	39	42 (+3)	39	42 (+3)	39	43 (+4)

**TABLE B: Results of the 2012-2013 FEPT**

	<b>Business Administration</b>		<b>Business Hospitality</b>		<b>Law</b>		<b>Economics</b>		<b>All Faculties</b>	
	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan
Number of Examinees (change)	300	300	77	77	297	297	228	228	902	902
Mean Listening Score (change)	20	23 (+3)	21	24 (+3)	19	22 (+3)	19	22 (+3)	19	22 (+3)
Mean Vocab/Grammar/Rdg Score (change)	21	21 (+0)	20	20 (+0)	20	20 (+0)	20	20 (+0)	20	21 (+1)
Mean Total Score (change)	40	44 (+4)	41	44 (+3)	38	42 (+4)	39	42 (+3)	39	43 (+4)

### **2011-2013 TOEIC Administration**

All freshman students scheduled to participate in the Asia University America Program (AUAP) in the second half of the 2012-2013 academic year (Cycle 2) and the first half of the 2013-2014 academic year (Cycle 1) took the TOEIC test before and after participating in the program. Based on the pre-scores, students were placed in AUAP classes at one of the three Washington University campuses where the program is held. International Relations students also took the test for the first time upon their entrance to Asia University, and those scores were used to place them in FE classes at the university. In addition, unlike the Business Administration, Economics, and Law faculties which use the FEPT strictly for placement purposes, the International Relations faculty uses the TOEIC test as a way to record the improvement of IR students as they progress through their English studies over their four years at the university. IR students must also obtain a score of at least 600 points on the test to graduate from the university.

As I noted in this journal before (2012, p. 36), starting in the 2004-2005 academic year, International Relations students participated in AUAP during

the second half of their freshman year. However, the International Relations Faculty changed the schedule in April of 2011, so that one-half of the IR students participated in AUAP in the second semester of their freshman year (Cycle 2, 2011-2012) and the other half participated in the second semester of their sophomore year (Cycle 2, 2012-2013). Starting in the 2013-2014 academic year, all IR students will participate in AUAP during the second half of their sophomore year. One exception to this is the new Multicultural Communications major students in the IR Department whom I will mention a little later. Together with reports that have appeared in the *CELE Journal* in the past (Koelbleitner & Messerklinger, 2006; Hull, 2012), this report helps provide a record of TOEIC scores that charts the changes in AUAP and IR that were started in 2011 and completed in 2013.

International Relations students who participated in AUAP during Cycle 2, 2012-2013 took their first TOEIC examination at Asia University in April of 2011 before the start of their Freshman English classes. Again, this was the first group of International Relations students to participate in AUAP during their second year at the university. These students took the test again in June of 2012, three months before leaving Japan for the United States, and then again in January of 2013 at the completion of their studies overseas.

Although most IR students attended the AUAP program at Western, Central, or Eastern Washington University, nine IR students with the highest TOEIC scores from the class that entered the university in 2011 attended ESL and related classes at Arizona State University during Cycle 2 of the 2012-2013 academic year. Along with the IR students who studied in Washington, this group took their first TOEIC test when they entered the university in April of 2011 and their second test in June of 2012. Their next

test was in April of 2013 at Asia University after they returned from their studies in Arizona.

Although both groups of IR students – those that attended the AUAP program in Washington and those that studied in Arizona – took practice tests upon their return to Asia University, I am not reporting the results of the practice tests this year. I reported those results last year (2013, p. 154) because the practice tests were mandatory for International Relations students and therefore had greater participation. However, the International Relations Faculty ended the requirement for the 2012-2013 academic year. That change resulted in a significantly smaller number of students taking the practice tests, different enough from student participation in the other tests to make the comparison of test results of extremely limited value. On the other hand, both Cycle 2, 2011-2012 and Cycle 2, 2012-2013 IR students took the regular TOEIC test together in August of 2013, and I do report those results here.

Business Administration, Law, and Economics students participated in the AUAP program in the first half of their sophomore year (Cycle 1, 2013-2014). The changes that the International Relations Faculty has made in the IR schedule have not affected their participation in AUAP. On the other hand, Cycle 1, 2013-2014 marks the first time that the new International Relations Multicultural Communications major students (MCC students) at Asia University participated in the AUAP program in Washington. All Cycle 1 students took the test in November of 2012 at Asia University three months before they left Japan and took it again in July 2013, in the United States, upon the conclusion of their studies there. Unlike the other students in this cycle, however, the MCC students also took the test upon their entrance to Asia University in April of 2012.

### **Results of the TOEIC**

I calculated average test scores for all of the TOEIC exams, and I included both listening and reading scores to present a more detailed report of the two major sections of the examination.

As shown in Tables C and G, test scores improved for both the Cycle 2, 2012-2013 International Relations students who participated in AUAP in Washington through January of 2013 and the IR students who studied at Arizona State University through April of 2013. The Washington students saw their average total scores increase by 61 points after one year and three months of study at Asia University. After participating in AUAP for about four months, their scores increased an additional 137 points. The IR students who studied at Arizona State University saw a 96-point increase in their average total scores after one year and three months of study at Asia University, and after studying at Arizona State University for five months they experienced an additional 81-point gain.

Recognizing that the Arizona students started with a substantially higher TOEIC score than the Washington students, it is not unexpected that Arizona students did not make quite as much progress as their Washington counterparts. Progress at a higher score level is ordinarily more difficult to make. The fact that the average total point gains by the Arizona students from entrance into Asia University until completion of their program in Arizona was as close as it was to that of the Washington students is rather remarkable in itself from that point of view. Entrance into the Arizona program is competitive, and the fact that the students who are selected to go to Arizona are recognized as more highly motivated and independent students of English compared to the Washington students may account for the kind of improvement they made despite their noticeably higher test



scores at the outset.

Similar to last year, the Washington students made the largest part of their gain shortly after completing their overseas program. They more than doubled the point gain during that time compared to the progress they made during the one year and three months they studied at Asia University before starting the AUAP program. On the other hand, the Arizona students made less improvement in their TOEIC scores after completing their studies in the United States compared to the improvement they had made while studying at Asia University. This difference may be due to the fact that the Washington students received explicit instruction in TOEIC whereas the Arizona students did not. The Arizona students studied the TOEFL in their AUAP program.

It is also worth comparing the results of Cycle 2, 2012-2013 with Cycle 2 of the previous year since these two cycles were made up of the same entering class of International Relations students. The 2011 entering class was divided into two groups as part of the International Relations Faculty transition to having all IR students participate in AUAP in their second year at the university. Although their length of study at Asia University before and after participating in AUAP differed, and though the dates that they took the TOEIC before and after their participation in AUAP differed, both groups took the test at the same time when they entered the university as freshman in April of 2011 and then again in August of 2013 in the middle of their junior year (before the completion of this article). That makes it possible to compare their total point gains to date regardless of the scheduling differences along the way.

To make this comparison valid, however, I had to eliminate students from both groups that did not sit for the August 2013 examination. That reduces

the 2012-2013 group by 23 students (Table D) and the 2011-2012 group by 31 students (Table F). At first glance, reducing each group by that much may seem to make the comparison of limited accuracy. However, if we compare Table C with D in the case of the 2012-2013 group, and then Table E with F in the case of the 2011-2012 group, we can see that the scores from entrance to just after completion of the AUAP program remain very consistent despite the size of the groups being reduced. This provides considerable weight to the comparison between the two groups through the August 2013 administration of the test. Comparing those results in Tables D and F, we can see that the 2012-2013 group made a greater total average gain over the 2011-2012 group of 47 points overall. A closer look at the two groups reveals that the 2012-2013 group made a little more progress than the 2011-2012 group each step along the way.

That the 2012-2013 group made a greater gain before participating in AUAP is not surprising because they had an additional year of study at Asia University before beginning their overseas program. However, what is remarkable is that the 2012-2013 group not only started with a noticeably higher TOEIC score when they entered the university but also continued to increase the point gap to the August 2013 examination. The gap between the two groups upon entrance was 73 points, and the gap in the August 2013 examination was 121 points. As with the comparison I made earlier between the Washington students and the Arizona students, the difference in the make-up of the two different Cycle 2 groups may be more responsible for this than the particular times the students attended their overseas programs or other factors. The 2012-2013 group consists of students who qualified for entrance to Asia University on the basis of their entrance test scores, whereas the 2011-2012 group is made up of students who qualified to enter

on the basis of a recommendation by their high school teachers. Typically at Asia University in any of the four departments, students who qualify on the basis of examination scores are stronger academic performers than students who qualify on the basis of recommendation.

Looking back at the comparisons I made between the two Cycle 2 groups last year (2013, p.149), it is now possible to see that the increase I previously reported – that the 2011-2012 group appeared to have made relative to the 2012-2013 group – was somewhat misleading. On the basis of the scores that were available at that time, it appeared that the 2011-2012 group had made significant progress in closing the gap between the two groups, particularly in their listening scores. However, the 2012-2013 group experienced an even greater gain in their listening scores at the completion of their studies overseas. As I reported last year, the 2011-2012 group's score improvement from pre-AUAP to post-AUAP was consistent with scores on record for the last six years (2013, p.149), i.e., in the neighborhood of 133 points. The 2012-2013 group marked a level of score improvement significantly higher than that – of around 195 points. The fact that their period of study in the United States was a whole year later than has normally been the case, along with the possibility that the group is a stronger academic group than the 2012-2013 group, may be largely responsible for that difference.

One troubling similarity between the groups worth reporting here is that both groups' scores declined after completing their overseas study (as evidenced by the August 2013 results). Both groups lost about seven points on average compared to their previous examination. This decline is similar to reports for Washington students in past years.

Unlike last year when the Arizona students continued to make

improvement in their practice test scores in August of 2012 after completing their studies abroad (Hull, 2013, p.155), the 2012-2013 group saw their scores drop by about 15 points. More results will need to be reported in the future to see whether that is typical for Arizona students, but it does suggest that last year's results may have been an exception.

Comparing the two groups of Arizona students the same way I compared the two groups of Washington students is possible up until the August 2013 examination (Tables G and H). Both groups were very small, on average nine students at the start. However, when the students who did not sit for the tests through April of 2013 are eliminated, the number reduces to seven in the case of the 2012-2013 group and to eight in the case of the 2011-2012 group. Similar to the comparison between the two Washington groups, the 2012-2013 Arizona group made noticeably more progress than the 2011-2012 group. The 2012-2013 group's scores increased on average about 177 points, whereas the 2011-2012 group's scores increased about 115 points. Unlike the case of the two groups of Washington students, the two groups of Arizona students did not have as big a gap in TOEIC scores upon entering the university. However, by the end of their study period overseas, the 2012-2013 group clearly established a rather large gap of 70 points. The two groups of Arizona students have the same difference that the two groups of Washington students have, which may be accountable for this. Like the 2012-2013 Washington group, the 2012-2013 Arizona group qualified for entrance to Asia University on the basis of merit, specifically by their entrance examination scores. On the other hand, the 2011-2012 group gained entrance to the university on the basis of a recommendation by their high school instructor.

Comparing the two groups of Arizona students all the way to the August

2013 test is not really possible, however, because so few of the 2011-2012 students took the examination in August. If we eliminate the students who did not sit for the August 2013 exam, the total number of students drops to only three for that group. Table H shows the comparison of results between the eight person group and the three person group. Unlike the case of the reduced groups for the Washington students, the differences in the group sizes and scores here are quite striking and, therefore, cannot be relied upon for comparison purposes with the 2012-2013 group. The August 2013 results for the three person group indicate a very significant point gain. However, a more careful look at the make-up of this group reveals that these three students had scored at the bottom of the group in previous administrations of the test and, therefore, had the most room to grow. These three students cannot be considered as representative of the group as a whole. The rest of the students in that group who had opted not to take the test in August had very high TOEIC scores and had already satisfied the 600 point graduation requirement.

Moving on to Table I, we can see Cycle 1, 2013-2014 students made the same kind of score improvement that I have reported for Cycle 1 students in past years (Hull, 2013, p.153; Hull, 2012, p. 38). Cycle 1, 2013-2014 students marked, within five points, the same improvement that was made by the Cycle 1 group the previous year. However, one important difference between the Cycle 1, 2013-2014 group and the Cycle 1, 2012-2013 group is the addition of the Multicultural Communications major students. Similar to other International Relations majors, these students spent more than one-half of their Freshman English class time on TOEIC skills during their first term at Asia University. On the other hand, Business, Law, and Economics students did not study TOEIC at all in their Freshman English classes. That

difference may account for why the MCC students, who entered the university in April with a TOEIC score that was on the lower end of the other faculties' previous November average, had an average score the following November that was the highest of the four faculties. A review of the previous tables for the IR students in Cycle 2 shows improvement for all groups of IR students from the entrance test in April of 2011 to the pre-test before beginning the AUAP program. The IR students appear to have benefited from their three months of TOEIC skills study, which the students from the other faculties did not have. A more complete comparison could be made if the Business, Law, and Economics students had an entrance test score, but that is not possible here since the students from those faculties take the university's FEPT at entrance instead of the TOEIC.

Another comparison that can be made between the Cycle 2 and Cycle 1 Washington students is how much improvement each group made before the start and after the finish of their AUAP studies. Last year, Cycle 1 students made considerably more progress in their scores compared to the Cycle 2 students, especially in the listening section (Hull, 2013, p.151). Although Cycle 1 students this year did make more score improvement than Cycle 2 students, the difference was not as noticeable as last year – less than a ten point difference in the case of the listening section and just a 22 point difference in total average scores. Furthermore, taking into account the increase in scores International Relations students ordinarily experience during the first term at Asia University when they study TOEIC test-taking skills that the students in the other departments do not study, the point differences appear even less notable.

Finally, similar to results from the last two years, Cycle 1 and 2 students made about two times the amount of score improvement in their listening

scores compared to their reading scores after completing their studies in Washington. The Arizona State University students also experienced the same kind of increase in their listening scores compared to their reading scores. This was unlike two years ago, when they made four times as much progress in the listening score relative to the reading score, and unlike last year, when they made about the same amount of progress in both skill sections.

### **Conclusion**

Consistent with past reports, average total scores for students who took the FEPT upon entrance to the university and at the end of the year improved for all four faculties. This was true even after inconsistencies in test group sizes were adjusted to eliminate students who did not sit for both administrations of the examination. This suggests that comparisons in past years, when inconsistencies in test groups were not adjusted, may have been accurate nevertheless.

Because the results I am reporting here are for Version 2.4 of the FEPT, which has significantly fewer items than previous versions of the test that have been reported on in past years, the amount of progress is naturally smaller – around four points on average. Also consistent with past reports is the fact that students made greater progress in their listening scores relative to their vocabulary, grammar, and reading scores. This may be due to the greater emphasis the Freshman English program places on oral communication skills than on reading and grammar.

Similar to results in recent years, as the International Relations student participation in AUAP has transitioned to the sophomore year, the results of the TOEIC are more complicated. The scores of Cycle 2, 2012-2013 International Relations students was similar to that for Cycle 2 students in

past years. After studying TOEIC test taking skills for three months, but before starting their AUAP program, they marked about a 19 percent improvement on their TOEIC scores. They then recorded their biggest gain, around 29 percent, after finishing the AUAP program. The experience in Washington clearly had a beneficial influence.

The Cycle 1, 2013-2014 students marked an even greater improvement of 45 percent from pre-test to post-test, almost exactly the same as the Cycle 1 group the year before (Hull, 2013, p. 152). On the other hand, if we include the point gains for Cycle 2 students from entrance into the university to completion of the AUAP program, the Cycle 2 students actually had an edge in total gain of about 54 percent. The case of the Multicultural Communications IR students in the Cycle 1 group makes for an interesting comparison with the Cycle 2 IR students. Like the Business, Law, and Economics students in Cycle 1, the MCC students registered a 41 percent improvement from pre-test to post-test. This was significantly greater than the 29 percent the other IR students experienced in Cycle 2. On the other hand, if we include their point gain from entrance to the university to completion of the AUAP program, their total gain is around 58 percent – in the end, not so different from the other IR major students. The Cycle 2 IR students had one and one-half full years of study at Asia University before starting their AUAP program, and during this time they made more improvement on the TOEIC than the MCC majors who studied just one year before beginning their AUAP program. The fact that the MCC students started their AUAP program with a significantly lower TOEIC score may also have contributed to their greater point gain during their studies overseas. They simply had more room to grow.



The Cycle 2, 2012-2013 Arizona students scored an average total point gain, from entrance to Asia University until completion of their studies in the United States, that was within 20 points of that of the Cycle 2 Washington students. This is quite remarkable considering the Arizona students started with scores that were considerably higher. However, the greater share of the improvement was made before starting their studies in Arizona. Their TOEIC score improvement from the pre-test just before studying in Arizona to the immediate post-test was markedly lower than either the Cycle 2 or Cycle 1 Washington students – by 44 points in the first case and 66 points in the second.

The Arizona students' progress on the TOEIC while still at Asia University may have been due to the opportunity they had to study the TOEIC exam. In Arizona, they experienced a shift in emphasis to the TOEFL examination. To compensate for the lack of opportunity to study the TOEIC in Arizona, the Cycle 2, 2013-2014 Arizona students are being given iPads loaded with TOEIC study applications to encourage improvement on the TOEIC through self-study while overseas. Next year's report should be able to provide a preliminary measure of the effectiveness of that effort.

This year, both Washington and Arizona Cycle 2 students experienced a decline in their TOEIC scores of about one or two percent after resuming their studies at Asia University for at least one term. Although typical for Washington students in past years, this was a change for the Arizona students compared to last year when the 2011-2012 students continued to make improvement in their scores seven months after returning to Japan. Last year's results raised a number of questions regarding possible differences between the Washington students and the Arizona students and questions about what could be done to help the Washington students

continue to improve their scores as the Arizona students had done upon their return to Asia University. Looking at the Arizona students' improvement in August of last year from the perspective of this year's results suggests that last year's results may actually have been an anomaly. Next year's report will help to clarify whether or not it actually was.

If the Cycle 2, 2011-2012 students are any indication, this halt in the improvement in TOEIC scores after returning to Japan may continue well past the first half year of the students' return from the United States. The Cycle 2, 2011-2012 students' scores also declined one and a half years after returning to Japan (Table F).

This disappointing decline in students' scores from seven months after the completion of their studies overseas to another full year after that should motivate us to consider what we can do for the students to capitalize on the significant overseas progress they make. It may not really be possible to create an environment in Japan that can rival the kind of opportunities the students have to improve their English skills while studying in the United States. However, we should not simply reconcile ourselves to the consistent pattern of decline that we can see in this report. Some students actually do continue to make improvement on their TOEIC scores after returning to Japan. The data for the three remaining students out of the original group of nine for the Cycle 2, 2011-2012 Arizona group (Table H) demonstrates rather dramatic improvement in TOEIC scores one year after returning to Japan. Furthermore, despite the drop in average total scores for the Cycle 2, 2012-2013 Washington students, 38 out of the 71 students in that group actually made improvement.

The chief issue, then, is what can be done to foster improvement in *all* of the students, not just half. After reviewing the TOEIC test results last year

(2013, p. 153), I concluded that studying the students more closely – their attitudes and motivation, and particularly their experience in their different AUAP sites – would help us understand more about the meaning of the differences in their scores. I also suggested it might help guide us in finding ways to build on the growth students experience while studying in the United States. However, perhaps it is just as important to do a study which examines in greater detail any differences that can be determined between students who continue to make improvement in their test scores after returning to Japan compared to those that do not. Do the students who continue to improve have individual study skills that result in greater success? Do they take greater advantage of the opportunities available at the university to continue making improvement? Do they have a higher level of motivation? Perhaps there is something we can learn from the more successful students after they return to Japan that can also guide us in helping the half whose scores decline after returning.

**TABLE C: Results of the 2012-2013 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Pre- and Post-AUAP, Washington Universities Students**

	<b>TOEIC, Cycle 2</b>		
	Apr '11	Jun '12	Jan '13
Number of Examinees	94	94	94
Mean Listening Score (change)	210	245 (+35)	335 (+90)
Mean Reading Score (change)	151	177 (+26)	224 (+47)
Mean Total Score (change)	361	422 (+61)	559 (+137)

**TABLE D: Results of the 2012-2013 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Pre- and Post-AUAP, Washington Universities Students**

	TOEIC, Cycle 2				
	Apr '11	Jun '12	Jan '13	Aug '13	Total Gain
Number of Examinees	71	71	71	71	71
Mean Listening Score (change)	211	251 (+40)	334 (+84)	324 (-10)	+113
Mean Reading Score (change)	151	180 (+29)	221 (+41)	224 (+3)	+73
Mean Total Score (change)	362	431 (+69)	555 (+124)	548 (-7)	+186

**TABLE E: Results of the 2011-2012 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Pre- and Post-AUAP, Washington Universities Students**

	TOEIC, Cycle 2		
	Apr '11	Jun '11	Jan '12
Number of Examinees	121	121	121
Mean Listening Score (change)	177	201 (+24)	275 (+74)
Mean Reading Score (change)	113	121 (+8)	159 (+38)
Mean Total Score (change)	289	322 (+33)	434 (+112)

**TABLE F: Results of the 2011-2012 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Pre- and Post-AUAP, Washington Universities Students**

	TOEIC, Cycle 2				
	Apr '11	Jun '11	Jan '12	Aug '13	Total Gain
Number of Examinees	90	90	90	90	90
Mean Listening Score (change)	175	203	277 (+74)	266 (-11)	+91
Mean Reading Score (change)	113	122	159 (+37)	161 (+2)	+48
Mean Total Score (change)	288	325	435 (+110)	427 (-8)	+139

**TABLE G: Results of the 2012-2013 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Arizona State University Students**

	<b>TOEIC, ASU Students</b>			
	April '11	June '12	Apr '13	Aug '13
Number of Examinees	7	7	7	7
Mean Listening Score (change)	288	355 (+67)	381 (+26)	386 (+5)
Mean Reading Score (change)	219	247 (+28)	302 (+55)	282 (-20)
Mean Total Score (change)	506	602 (+96)	683 (+81)	668 (-15)

**TABLE H: Results of the 2011-2012 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Arizona State University Students**

	<b>TOEIC, ASU Students</b>			
	Apr '11	Jun '11	Apr '12	Aug '13
Number of Examinees (change)	8 [3]*	8 [3]	8 [3]	[3]
Mean Listening Score (change)	318 [318]	336 (+18) [325] (+7)	385 (+49) [353] (+28)	[440] (+87)
Mean Reading Score (change)	209 [180]	226 (+17) [215] (+35)	284 (+58) [260] (+45)	[292] (+32)
Mean Total Score (change)	526 [498]	561 (+35) [540] (+42)	669 (+108) [613] (+73)	[731] (+118)

\* [ ] indicates the numbers for those students who took all four TOEIC tests

**TABLE I: Results of the 2013-2014 TOEIC, Cycle 1**

	TOEIC, Cycle 1									
	Bus		Law		Econ		MCC		Four Faculties	
	Nov '12	Jly '13	Nov '12	Jly '13	Nov '12	Jly '13	Nov '12	Jun '13	Nov '12	June, Jly '13
Number of Examinees (change)	57	57	38	38	36	36	79	79	210	210
Mean Listening Score (change)	195	288 (+93)	186	281 (+95)	181	277 (+96)	201	292 (+91)	193	286 (+93)
Mean Reading Score (change)	131	187 (+56)	125	188 (+63)	120	171 (+51)	141	192 (+51)	131	186 (+55)
Mean Total Score (change)	326	475 (+149)	310	469 (+159)	301	448 (+147)	342	483 (+141)	325	472 (+147)

**TABLE J: Results of the 2011-2014 TOEIC for MCC Students, Cycle 1 of 2013-2014**

	TOEIC, Cycle 1		
	MCC		
	April '12	Nov '12	June '13
Number of Examinees (change)	79	79	79
Mean Listening Score (change)	182	201 (+19)	292 (+91)
Mean Reading Score (change)	123	141 (+18)	192 (+51)
Mean Total Score (change)	305	342 (+37)	483 (+141)

## References

- Hull, J. (2012). Results of the 2010-11 FEPT and TOEIC tests. *CELE Journal*, 20, 34-38.
- Hull, J. (2013). Review and analysis of Asia University's 2012 Freshman English Placement Test, transition from version 2.3 to version 2.4. *CELE Journal*, 20, 1-11.
- Hull, J. (2013). Results of the 2011-12 FEPT and TOEIC tests. *CELE Journal*, 21, 142-156.
- Koelbleitner, C., & Messerklinger, J. (2006). Results of the 2005-6 FEPT and 2003-4 TOEIC tests. *CELE Journal*, 14, 111-113.
- Messerklinger, J. (2008). Results of the 2007 FEPT. *CELE Journal*, 16, 6-16.
- Messerklinger, J. (2009). Results of the 2008 FEPT. *CELE Journal*, 17, 49-59.